intended by him as temporary measure as some of his followers want this measure to be; it was measure which he intended to hand down to posterity permanently on the statute book of this Province. 1-45 p.m.

" Mr. President, I do not feel called upon at this stage to answer all the criticisms that have been advanced, because I observe there is a general concensus of opinion that the Bill should go before a Select Committee. But I may perhaps be permitted to remove one misapprehension with regard to what prevails in other countries and other provinces of this country. My hon. Friend said that wherever compulsion had been introduced education was also made free."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" In England it is the case."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" It is not the case in England. My hon. Friend, Dr. Subbarayan, knows that it is not the case and has said so just now."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" I have got the testimony of Mr. Winter to the effect that it is so."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" Well Sir, then it is a case of one oath against another. I cannot myself speak with first hand knowledge of the state of things in England. But in several other provinces of our country where statutory provision has been made for compulsion, education is free only in public schools. Private schools are at liberty to levy fees. And that is exactly the provision which we are seeking to introduce in the present Bill.

" Sir, I am not going into a detailed examination of the various criticisms that have been made on the Bill. I am glad to note there is a general agreement on the question that it should be referred to a Select Committee. I am also glad to see that the House is in favour of having the Select Committee's report presented before 3rd November."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that Bill No. 24 of 1931 be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Members proposed and that the Committee be asked to present their report before 3rd November 1931."

The motion was carried.

XIII.—RESOLUTION UNDER THE COTTON TRANSPORT ACT.

* The hon'ble Mr. P. T. RAJAN :—" Sir, I beg to move the following resolution :—

' *This Council recommends to the Government that the following notification laid in draft before the Council under section* 8 *of the Cotton Transport Act,* 1923 (*III of* 1923) (*XXXIV of* 1925), *be approved and issued by the Local Government in the form in which it has been so laid:—*

Notification.

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) *of section* 3 *of the Cotton Transport Act,* 1923 (*III of* 1923), *the Governor acting with Ministers is hereby pleased to issue the following*

[Mr. P. T. Rajan] [30th October 1931

amendments to Development Department Notification No. 278, *dated* 19*th September* 1928, *published at pages* 1455 *to* 1461 *of Part I of the* Fort St. George Gazette, *dated* 25*th September* 1928, *as subsequently amended:—*

Amendments.

In paragraph 2 *of Schedule II appended to the said notification—*

(i) *After the words 'from Villupuram to Trichinopoly both inclusive', the words 'from Cuddalore to Vriddhachalam both inclusive', and after the words 'from Trichinopoly to Erode both inclusive', the words 'from Sembatta and Chettinad to Parayankulam on the Trichinopoly-Manamadurai section' shall be inserted; and*

(ii) *for the words 'from Salem junction to Salem town both inclusive', the words 'from Salem junction to Vriddhachalam both inclusive, from Salem junction to Mettur dam both inclusive' shall be substituted.'*

"With a view to maintain the purity of cotton grown, the Province was divided into two areas and in order to prevent import of cotton from one area to another a notification was issued under paragraph 2 of Schedule II of the Development Department Notification, dated 19th September 1928. That notification states that cotton can be imported into the area only if the person holds a licence. Consequent on the opening of the new railway lines in the southern area it has been found necessary that these lines also should be included in the notification. This is a formal resolution and I hope the House will be pleased to pass it."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

XIV.—AMENDMENT TO SCHEDULE IV OF THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920.

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"Sir, I beg to move the following motion:—

'*That the following amendment to the provision made to determine the percentages of turnover of business transacted in the area of a municipality and published with Local Self-Government Department Notification No.* 715 *at pages* 344–45 *of Part I-A of the* Fort St. George Gazette, *dated* the 14*th April* 1931, *which the Governor acting with Ministers proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by clause* (*b*) *of sub-rule* (1) *and sub-rule* (2) *of rule* 18 *of Schedule IV to the Madras District Municipalities Act,* 1920 (*Madras Act V of* 1920), *be approved:—*

That the words "per annum" occurring in the first and second items in column (1) *of the schedule appended to the said provision be omitted.'*